UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,019	10/23/2003	Brijesh Krishnaswami	MS306622.01/MSFTP529US	2371

27195 7590 10/29/2008

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
WANG, RONGFA PHILIP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/29/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/693,019	KRISHNASWAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHILIP WANG	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *40-75* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *40-75* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *40,69 and 73* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/14/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Per Applicant's request, claims 1-8, 10-18, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 38 and 39 have been canceled; claims 40-75 are new.

2. Claims 40-75 are pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 40 does not end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 69 and 73 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claimed computer readable medium can be copied and distributed without exercising the method of they depend on and therefore fails the infringement test.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 40-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 40-63 recite the limitation of a configuration management system. A system without specific inclusion of a piece of hardware can be interpreted as software. Software is not considered as a statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 40-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Independent claims 40 and 74 and their dependent claims recite the limitation of "a unified configuration store" and "converts information associated with an application into unified persisted information". Similarly, independent claims 64, 67, 69, 70, 73, 75 and their dependent claims recite the limitation of "unified persisted information".

Upon reviewing the applicant's specification, there is no definition of what is the definition of "a unified configuration store" or "unified persisted information", therefore no conversion of information to the unified persisted information is defined. The interpretation of "a unified configuration store" can be different from a standardized description (see specification, page 9, line 14) or common configuration data structure (for example, specification, page 2, lines 1-2). Further, claim 75 includes the limitation of "common attributes for all applications". Upon reviewing the disclosed specification, it does not appear the specification discloses "common attributes for all applications".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 40-57, 59-62, 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468).

As per claim 40,

Keller discloses

- a configuration store that stores persisted information associated with an application, the persisted information comprising of configuration information and dependency information (Fig. 2A, [0097], [0098] where discloses a system that containing configuration store 225 comprising dependency information. [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files.); and,
- a configuration service component that manages access to the configuration store, (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The configuration store is a unified configuration store; and converts information associated with an application into unified persisted information.

However, Ahlstrom discloses

- The configuration store is a unified configuration store (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…"); and
- converts information associated with an application into unified persisted information (C12:9-15, claim 4, "…identifying a configuration…converting the configuration information into a standard format…" One interpretation of a unified configuration data is configuration data with standard format.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

As per claim 41, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the information associated with an application is at least one of configuration information or dependency information([0097], [0098] where discloses a system that containing configuration store 225 comprising dependency information.).

As per claim 42, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component receives a manifest associated with the application, the manifest comprising at least one of configuration and dependency information associated with the application(Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230."; [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files);

Ahlstrom discloses

and the configuration service component converts and stores at least some of the manifest information in the unified configuration store(c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";C12:9-15, claim 4, "…identifying a configuration…converting the configuration information into a standard format…" One interpretation of a unified

configuration data is configuration data with standard format.).

As per claim 43, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the manifest is based, at least in part, upon a schema ([0153], "…XML Schema…").

As per claim 44, the rejection of claim 43 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the schema is XML-based ([0153], "…XML Schema…").

As per claim 45, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the manifest employing at least one of strong typing, validation, and assertions ([0145], "…applying filter rules…" where applying rules is validation).

As per claim 46, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein the configuration service component compiles at least one of manifest information into a namespace, the configuration service component providing access to the namespace ([0128], "…navigate...the model.... a

globally unique name for identifying the component..." where navigation provides access to the information.).

As per claim 47, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom disclose

further comprising a configuration management engine that identifies configuration information within the unified persisted information and facilitates management of at least a portion of the configuration information (Keller discloses facilitates management and identification of configuration information, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230, for at least the reason that queries requires identification of information; Ahlstrom discloses unified persisted information, c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";).

As per claim 48, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- the configuration service component facilitating access to a legacy store ([0118], "…the Microsoft Windows Registry…" where registry can be accessed.).

As per claim 49, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the legacy store comprising a registry ([0118], "…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 50, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the configuration service component facilitating at least one management service(Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

As per claim 51, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the management service comprising at least one of a group policy component and a roaming component(FIG 2A, 250 Policy).

As per claim 52, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the management service facilitating at least one of install, usage, servicing, uninstall, roaming, migration, setup, provisioning, policy, backup and/or restore ([0009], "…installation…").

As per claim 53, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

further comprising an assertion engine that facilitates administration of a validation rule by the configuration service component (Fig. 2A, 245 Dependency Service, where dependency is validated.).

As per claim 54, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

further comprising a notification handler that provides information associated with a configuration change of the application to at least one of the application and another application ([0082], "… provides a publish/subscribe interface for notifying for changes…").

As per claim 55, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- further comprising a legacy handler that facilitates synchronization of the system with a legacy store ([0118], "…maintain references…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 56, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- the legacy store comprising a registry ([0118], "…maintain references…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 57, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component facilitates transacted commits for saving related changes together in the unified configuration store (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

As per claim 59, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component facilitates change logs and history ([0082], "…a notion of history in order to detect and determine changes…").

As per claim 60, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom disclose

wherein the unified configuration store comprises a joint engine technology database that stores a settings namespace (Keller -FIG 2A for database, where database supports joint operation; Ahlstrom- c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";).

As per claim 61, the rejection of claim 60 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein a namespace comprises metadata on settings comprising types, attributes, and user context, the namespace further comprising instance values of the settings ([0153], "…XML Schema…"; [0114], "…user profiles and preferences…"; [0149], "… the descriptions of services and components or the retrieval of values of specific attributes…").

As per claim 62, the rejection of claim 61 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein at least one of the metadata on the settings and instance values of the settings is stored for each user context ([0114], "…user profiles and preferences…").

As per claims 67 and 69

Keller discloses

- receiving a manifest associated with an application, the manifest comprising at least configuration information and dependency information (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230."; [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files);

- registering the manifest; processing the manifest to generate persisted information from at least one of the configuration information or the dependency information; and storing at least some of the persisted information in a configuration store ([0082], "…registered for changes within the dependency model…").

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is unified and the configuration store is unified.

However, Ahlstrom

- The persisted information is unified and the configuration store is unified (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

As per claim 68, the rejection of claim 67 is incorporated;

Keller/Ahlstrom disclose

further comprising compiling at least a portion of the unified persisted information into a namespace (Keller: [0152] for URI, Ahlstrom, c8:56-58 for standard format.).

8. Claims 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al.(herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468) and further in view of Pham et al. (herein Pham, USPTN 5,524,253).

As per claim 64,

Keller discloses

A configuration management system comprising:

- a local cache that at least temporarily stores changes to persisted information associated with an application; and a tracking engine that facilitates communication of the changed persisted information to a configuration service component(store (Fig. 2B, shows an Administrator GUI 285 containing memory which is cache stores requests sent to the system; see FIG. 2A).

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is unified.

However, Ahlstrom discloses

- The persisted information is unified (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…" One interpretation of unified persisted information is standard representation of the information.);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to include the limitation discloses by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Keller/ Ahlstrom do not specifically disclose

- The changed unified persisted information stored in the local cache.

However, Pham discloses

- The changed unified persisted information stored in the local cache (c7:14-20, "…source machine's format is converted to destination machine's formation…using locally stored routines…on the source machine…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Pham into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the limitation disclosed by Pham. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to allow applications having different physical data characteristic to communicate as suggested by Pham (see abstract).

As per claim 65, the rejection of claim 64 is incorporated;

Ahlstrom

the unified persisted information comprising at least a standardized representation of configuration information (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…".)

As per claim 66, the rejection of claim 65 is incorporated;

Ahlstrom

the configuration information comprises at least information other than dependency information (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…"; c6:55-60).

9. Claims 70-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giel et al. (herein Giel, USPGN 2002/0169738) in view of Kaltenmark et al. (herein Kaltenmark, USPTN 7,415,509).

As per claims 70, 73,

Giel discloses

providing a manifest, the manifest associated with configuration information of a first application (claim 18, shows collector collecting configuration information);

processing the manifest to generate unified persistent information associated with an application (claim 19, "...converting configuration information into uniform format"); and

accessing a configuration setting of an application within the unified persistent information (claim 18, "…analyzing the configuration information…").

Giel does not specifically disclose

- dependency information

However, Kaltenmark discloses

- dependency information (c10: 54-55, "…dependency information is maintained by the configuration…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kaltenmark into the teachings of Giel to include the limitation disclosed by Kaltenmark. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to perform impact analysis by providing dependency information as suggested by Kaltenmark (C10:50-54).

As per claim 71, the rejection of claim 70 is incorporated;

Giel discloses

at least one of the following acts:

identifying settings in a namespace associated with the first application; defining a name, a type, a description and default value for a setting; defining other metadata for the setting;

providing a validation rule for the setting; indicating service applicability for the setting; and, identifying a dependency using an assertion expression ([0085], "...analyzed using rules written by the expert..." show a validation rule)..

As per claim 72, the rejection of claim 71 is incorporated;

Giel discloses at least one of the following acts:

accessing a setting associated with the first application; and,

accessing a setting associated with a second application (claim 18, "…analyzing the configuration information…").

10. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468) and further in view of Eager et al. (herein Eager, US Patent. No. 5,960,200).

As per claim 58, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom do not specifically disclose

> wherein the configuration service component employs at least one of ACL-based security and role-based security are provided at per-setting granularity.

However, Eager discloses

> wherein the configuration service component employs at least one of ACL-based security and role-based security are provided at per-setting granularity(c21:38, "...ACL...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Eager into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the above limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to controlling access to application resources of Windows applications as suggested by Eager ([0089]).

11. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468), Eager et al. (herein Eager, US Patent. No. 5,960,200), and further in

view of Bondarenko et al. (herein Bondarenko, US PGPub. No. 2004/0083479).

As per claim 63, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Eager do not specifically disclose

at least one of URI and Xpath can access a setting within a namespace as well as in between namespaces.

However, Bondarenko et al. disclose

- at least one of URI and Xpath can access a setting within a namespace as well as in between namespaces[0069], for Xpath; and [0101], for URI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Bondarenko into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Eager to include the above limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to enable third party integration of the application as suggested by Bondarenko ([0007], "…third-party integration…").

12. Claims 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hellerstein et al. (herein Hellerstein, US PGpub. No. 2002/0129356) in view of Keller et al. (herein Keller, US PGPub. No. 2004/0049509) and further in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468).

As per claim 74,

Hellerstein discloses

- a configuration service component that manages access to a configuration store, the configuration service component comprising an assertion engine component, wherein the configuration store stores persisted configuration information associated with an application (Fig. 1, [0005], "In step 2, a configuration file or database…. This configuration file is typically updated…").
- , the assertion engine component facilitates administration of a validation rule by the configuration service component ([0048], "…A policy repository…entered periodically by the…administrator…" where policies are considered validation rules);

Hellertein does not specifically disclose

- and a legacy handler component facilitates synchronization with a legacy store including a registry..

However Keller discloses

- a legacy handler component facilitates synchronization with a legacy store including a registry.. ([0118], "…maintain references…the configuration files located…may contain this information. Examples…include…Microsoft Windows Registry….").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Keller et al. into the teachings of

Hellertein to include with a legacy store including a registry. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to share information among various heterogeneous systems as suggested by Keller ([0018]).

Hellertein /Keller do not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is unified and the configuration store is unified.

However, Ahlstrom

- The persisted information is unified and the configuration store is unified (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Hellertein /Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

As per claim 75,

Hellertein discloses

A configuration management system comprising:

- means for storing configuration information associated with an application ; and means for managing access to the means for storing configuration information (Fig. 1, [0005], "In step 2, a configuration file or database…. This configuration file is typically updated…").

- Means for facilitating administration of a validation rule ([0048], "…A policy repository…entered periodically by the…administrator…" where policies are considered validation rules);

Hellertein does not specifically disclose

- means for synchronizing the means for storing configuration information with a legacy store including a registry.

However Keller discloses

- means for synchronizing the means for storing configuration information with a legacy store including a registry ([0118], "…maintain references…the configuration files located…may contain this information. Examples…include…Microsoft Windows Registry….").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Keller into the teachings of Hellertein to include with a legacy store including a registry. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to share information among various heterogeneous systems as suggested by Keller ([0018]).

Hellertein /Keller do not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is unified comprising a standardized structure and common attributes for all applications and configuration information and the configuration store is unified.

However, Ahlstrom

- The persisted information is unified comprising a standardized structure and common attributes for all applications and configuration information and the configuration store is unified. (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Hellertein /Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-5934. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 4:00PM. Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip R. Wang/

10/24/2008